



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,334	05/11/2001	Dan Kikinis	007287.00035	7799
22907	7590	09/08/2009		EXAMINER
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2421	
				MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			09/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/854,334	Applicant(s) KIKINIS ET AL.
	Examiner Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	Art Unit 2421

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-12,14-16,18-25,27-31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-16, 18-25, 27-31, 33-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/89/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Pre-Brief Conference decision on July 1, 2009, prosecution is hereby reopened. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.
2. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-16, 18-25, 27-35 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejection under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-12, 14-16, 18-19, 22-25, 27-29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0288366 by Boylan, III et al. (“Boylan”).

It should be noted that hereinafter the use of the clause “see at least” should be interpreted that the cited portions that follow the clause are not the only portions that are considered to be relevant. Should Applicant find that the cited portions are not relevant, other portions of the disclosure of the prior art reference will be provided as additional evidence and/or context to the relevancy of the previously cited portions. Since the evidence is from the same reference, the introduction of the additional evidence in response to Applicant’s arguments should not therefore be considered to be that of new grounds of rejection.

Claim 1

Boylan discloses *a system* (see at least FIG. 5, User TV Equipment 54), comprising:

a memory (see at least FIG. 5, STB 58 and [0038]) *storing a first object* (see at least [0038], e.g., application program stored on STB for providing interactive television programming guide), *a second object, the second object configured to define an interactive component for display in an interactive electronic programming guide (EPG),*

the interactive component including localized content (see at least [0004], application program for provide non-programming products and services; [0007-0010], e.g., application program to providing local ads;) *and a third object corresponding to content information for display in the EPG* (see at least [0038], e.g., program listings information); *and*

a processor (see at least [0038], e.g., processor of the STB 58) *configured to generate the interactive EPG by combining the first object, the second object and the third object, wherein a layout of the interactive EPG is defined by the first object* (see at least FIGs. 13, 15 which shows different EPG layouts).

Claim 12

Claim 12 is a method claim that corresponds to the system claim 1. Therefore, Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in Claim 1.

Claim 23

Claim 12 is an apparatus claim (i.e., *a machine-readable storage medium tangibly embodying a sequence of instructions executable by a processor*) that corresponds to Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in Claim 1.

Claims 2, 14 and 24

Rejections of base claims 1, 12 and 23, respectively are incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the system comprises a set-top box, a television, or a VCR* (see at least FIG. 5, equipment 54).

Claims 3 and 25

Rejections of base claims 1 and 23, respectively are incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the system includes a plurality of drivers, one of the drivers communicating with a separate unit to replenish programming information* (see at least FIG. 5, since a driver is, by definition, a program that determines how a computer will communicate with a peripheral

device, the set-top box has different drivers in order to communicate with the tuner(s), the memory – whether internal or external –, VCR, TV, etc.).

Claim 4 (canceled)

Claim 15

The rejection of base claim 12 and 23 is incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the first object is selected from a plurality of world objects, each of the plurality of world objects configured to define a different EPG layout for displaying the content programming information* (see at least [0038], e.g., the claimed *world objects* are interpreted to read on the various program listings – program listings for PPV programs in FIG. 4; program listings for a region in FIG. 15 and [0070-0072]).

Claims 5, 16 and 27

Rejections of base claims 1, 12 & 23 and intervening claims 4; 13, 14 & 24, 26, respectively are incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the third object includes at least one of a schedule times, channel identification and a title* (see at least [0037-0038]).

Claim 7

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 4 are incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the second object is configured to provide non-EPG e-commerce interactivity* (see at least FIGs. 13 and 15).

Claim 8

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the first object is selected from a plurality of world objects based on a selected type of programming, wherein each of the plurality of world objects defines a different EPG layout* (see at least [0038], e.g., the claimed *world objects* are interpreted to read on the various program listings – program listings for PPV programs in FIG. 4; program listings for a region in FIG. 15 and [0070-0072]).

Claim 11

The rejections of base claim 1 is incorporated. Boylan further discloses *a user interface configured to receive user interaction with the localized content of the interactive EPG* (see at least FIG. 15, e.g., user can highlight and click on the local advertisement).

Claim 13 (canceled)

Claims 18 and 28

Pursuant to Claim 18, the rejection of base claim 12 is incorporated.

Pursuant to Claim 28, the rejection of base claim 23 is incorporated.

Boylan further discloses *wherein the second object is a non-EPG e-commerce objects* (see at least FIGs. 13 and 15).

Claims 19 and 29

Rejections of base claims 12 & 23 and intervening claims 13-18 & 24-28 are respectively incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the first object is selected from a plurality of world objects based on selected programming content* (see at least [0038], e.g., the claimed *world objects* are interpreted to read on the various program listings – program listings for PPV programs in FIG. 4; program listings for a region in FIG. 15 and [0070-0072]).

Claim 22

The rejection of base claim 12 is incorporated. Boylan further discloses *further comprising generating a user interface coupled to the EPG and configured to receive user interaction with the localized interactive component* (see at least FIG. 15, e.g., user can highlight and click on the local advertisement).

Claim 26 (canceled)

Claim 35

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Boylan further discloses *wherein the interactive component is based on the content information displayed in the EPG* (see at least [0081]).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which form the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-10, 20-21, 30-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan, as applied to the corresponding base and intervening claims, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,906 to Finseth et al. ("Finseth").

Claim 9

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 8 are incorporated. Boylan does not specifically disclose *wherein the first object defines a virtual world and a subset of the virtual world is displayed as a matrix of rectangular boxes containing current program information*.

However, in an analogous art, Finseth does disclose a matrix of rectangular boxes containing program information (see at least FIG. 8A).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this feature of Finseth in Boylan because the use of the feature would enhance the program listings information in Boylan.

Claim 10

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claims 4 & 7 are incorporated. Boylan does not specifically disclose *wherein the second object is received in real time*. However, this

feature is deemed inherent to Finseth because the electronic catalog (see at least 20:27-29) disclosed in Finseth should be updated in real-time to reflect the inventory of items in stock so that when a user searches the electronic catalog for an purchasing item and /or places an order, the item(s) is/are available or shown to be available in the near future. Without the real-time operating capability, e-commerce would be inefficient and the sales company would lose credibility and business very quickly.

Claim 20

The rejection of base claim 12 is incorporated. Boylan does not specifically disclose *wherein the first object defines a virtual world and wherein a subset of the virtual world is displayed as a matrix of rectangular boxes containing current program information.*

However, in an analogous art, Finseth does disclose a matrix of rectangular boxes containing program information (see at least FIG. 8A).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this feature of Finseth in Boylan because the use of the feature would enhance the program listings information in Boylan.

Claim 30

The rejection of base claim 23 and intervening claims 24, 26-29 are incorporated. Boylan does not specifically disclose *wherein the first object defines a virtual world and wherein a subset of the virtual world is displayed as a matrix of rectangular boxes containing current program information.*

However, in an analogous art, Finseth does disclose a matrix of rectangular boxes containing program information (see at least FIG. 8A).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this feature of Finseth in Boylan because the use of the feature would enhance the program listings information in Boylan.

Claim 31

Rejections of base claim 23 and intervening claims 24, 26-30 are incorporated. Boylan-Finseth further discloses *wherein the first object is user-selected from a plurality of world objects, each of the plurality of world objects defining a different layout for displaying the programming information* (Boylan; see at least [0038], e.g., the claimed *world objects* are interpreted to read on the various program listings – program listings for PPV programs in FIG. 4; program listings for a region in FIG. 15 and [0070-0072]).

Claims 21 and 33

Pursuant to Claim 21, rejections of base claim 12 and intervening claim 18 are incorporated.

Pursuant to Claim 33, the rejection of base claim 23 is incorporated.

Boylan does not specifically disclose *receiving the second object in real time*. However, this feature is deemed inherent to Finseth because the electronic catalog (see at least 20:27-29) disclosed in Finseth should be updated in real-time to reflect the inventory of items in stock so that when a user places an order, the item(s) is/are available or shown to be available in the near future. Without the real-time operating capability, e-commerce would be inefficient and the sales company would lose credibility and business very quickly.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the real-time feature of Finseth in Boylan for the purpose discussed above.

Claim 34

The rejections of base claim 23 and intervening claim 33 are incorporated. Boylan-Finseth further discloses *further comprising generating a user interface coupled to the EPG and configured to receive user interaction with the localized interactive component* (Boylan; see at least FIGs. 13, 15).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu "Antony" Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2400 Group receptionist (571) 272-2400.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

September 1, 2009

Application/Control Number: 09/854,334

Art Unit: 2421

Page 10